Forthcoming as The Augustan Senate and the reconfiguration of time on the Fasti Capitolini. In *Augustus and the Destruction of History: The Politics of the Past in Early Imperial Rome*. Gildenhard, Ingo, Gotter, Ulrich, Havener, Wolfgang & Hodgson, Louise. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society. 157-186.

The Augustan Senate and the reconfiguration of time on the Fasti Capitolini

At some point during the reign of Augustus, a team of stonecutters carved the names of every man who had ever been consul at Rome and every man who had ever celebrated a triumph or ovation onto an arch in the Forum Romanum. Large portions of the lists they made have survived; they are known to us as the Capitoline Fasti or Fasti Capitolini because they are now held in the Musei Capitolini, where for most visitors their primary role is to provide a backdrop for the famous Capitoline wolf. For historians, though, they hold their own fascination, not only as a source of information about the early Republic, but also as a document of how Romans of Augustus' time understood their own history.

The Fasti Capitolini make possible a way of relating to the past which may at first seem simple and recognisable to modern eyes. They fit easily into one definition of 'history' with which we are familiar: lists of events which took place in past time. For historians, they are comforting, tangible evidence of some of the basic facts we use as building blocks in our own narratives. We can use them to assemble our own prosopographical lists, to confirm our chronological hypotheses, or even just to enjoy the thrill of seeing names we have come to know well from literary sources written in stone.

The Fasti's original audience would also have been able to use them to construct a relationship with the past. The paradigm of history these inscriptions made possible when they were first erected was different from the associations they conjure in us today, but at the time it was both new and striking. Set up in the Forum, the Fasti gave Romans the opportunity to see their entire history, year by year, made permanent in stone. The Augustan Age is a period we tend to think of as a time of dynamic change; in this context, though they themselves were an innovation, the Fasti

provided an image of history as a stable, comprehensible, and fixed entity. They reflected on the past, on tradition, on the Republic, and on the relationship those historical concepts had with the Augustan present and the future – a relationship they laid out in terms of continuity rather than change. In this paper, I explore how exactly the inscriptions framed history and why, at that moment, the choice was made to monumentalise the past in this specific format.

Choice is an active, not a passive process, and we can understand the Fasti better if we consider the agents involved. It was not Augustus but the Senate who decided to erect this inscription, and in doing so they proposed their own view of history and the present generation's place in it: a senatorial history. Once we recognise their role, it becomes easier to see that the approach to the past the monument embodies is different from that found in, say, the Forum of Augustus. We can then ask how and why that should be. The Age of Augustus was not a monolith, with all its cultural products the result of trickle-down from the authoritative ideological pronouncements of the *princeps*. This much we all know, but it is easy to forget and good to be reminded. By considering the Senate's role we can trace in this monument an alternative historical paradigm. There could be no denying that Augustus himself had ultimate control over all Rome's state monuments, and his version of history was always going to be the most widely disseminated. His statue stood resplendent on top of the arch on which the Fasti were inscribed, and the entire monument was erected in his honour. But there was still room for other voices, and in their role as providers of honours to the *princeps* the Senate had a chance to make their voice heard. The Fasti Capitolini show the Senate actively inserting themselves into developing discourses of history and memory.

1. The inscriptions

The Fasti Capitolini consist of two separate lists inscribed on stone. One lists all the triumphators, from Romulus in the first year of Rome's life to Lucius Cornelius Balbus in 19 BCE. The second contains all the consuls, from the beginning of the new Republic down to the year 13 CE. In this chapter, the consul list is my main focus: as will become clear, it offers a specific historical paradigm

that deserves to be treated in its own right as well as in the context of the triumph list and the monument as a whole.[1]

The inscriptions themselves were masterfully edited by Attilio Degrassi, who painstakingly identified each fragment and pieced them together.[2] The lists he reconstructed are vital evidence for scholars of Republican history, but the idea of using the Fasti as a chronological tool or a way to check who exactly was consul in any given year – an early stone edition of Broughton's *Magistrates of the Roman Republic* – is entirely modern. These lists were inscribed for permanence and set up in public view in a central place with official backing, but as far as we know no Roman ever consulted or referred to them as an authoritative record for the facts they contained. We do not have a single example in ancient literature of a historian citing any set of epigraphic Fasti as a source.

So what was the experience of a Roman looking at the Fasti Capitolini? All inscriptions allow for at least two (often overlapping) modes of viewing: as text and as image. Often the overall visual impact of the stone is just as important, if not more so, than the details of the text's content. The letters which make up the Fasti were small, the text was long, and the content was repetitive and likely uninteresting to most passers-by. As a whole, though, the inscriptions were large and eye-catching. The sheer volume of text was more striking than any individual word. The relationship to history they suggested to each viewer was constructed at least as much by their overall visual impact as by the information they contained.

To say more about how the Fasti Capitolini functioned as visual objects, we must look in detail at the way they order their information and how the inscription is laid out on the stone. Dennis Feeney has drawn attention to at least four different temporal patterns at work in the inscribed consul list.[3] The consular year is joined by the sequence of censorial *lustra*, the dating system *ab urbe*

[1] Wolfgang Havener's paper elsewhere in this volume treats the triumph lists in more detail.
[2] Degrassi 1947.
[3] Feeney 2007 172-82; further discussion in Hannah 2013 92-4.

condita, and the long cycle of the Secular Games. Feeney brings out clearly how these four modes of reckoning time work together with, and against, each other, and how small changes in the way the information is displayed (for example, the switch in the final columns to listing Augustus' *tribunicia potestas* ahead of the consuls of the year) make for big ideological differences in how the calendar, and time itself, should be understood. In this section, I highlight one further consequence of the patterns Feeney finds: they each create different visual effects.

For the viewer, the lists order the past spatially and visually as well as conceptually. If we take a step back and see them as a whole rather than concentrating on individual details, they do not so much record as diagram a number of different ways of dividing and reckoning time. In the consul lists, the most obvious temporal unit is the consular year. Visually, the sequence of years translates into a simple spatial pattern: usually, one line per year (Fig. 1). The two consuls are listed side by side, with the senior consul placed first; the result is two parallel columns, one of all senior and one of all junior consuls. These lists refer to a regular annual rhythm, a way of understanding time that fits with the way Cicero's generation naturally dated events of the recent past: 'when X and Y were consul'.

In the left-hand margin, prominent because they occupy otherwise blank space, a number is given once every ten years (for example, ~~D~~LX [560] in line 1 of figure 1). These numbers refer to a different dating convention which referred to the number of years *ab urbe condita* – 'since the city was founded'. They tie the 'republican' time of consular years to a greater whole, including the regal period. Another semi-regular cycle, that of the censorship, also links the time of the consuls back to pre-republican *lustra*.[4] Unlike the years *a.u.c.*, this third pattern is not laid out in parallel to the rhythm of consuls, but within it. The names of censors are inserted into the main list, but visually they are not subsumed. They are indented on the left and run across both columns (lines 8 and 14 of figure

[4] Censors were usually elected every five years; they held office for eighteen months and closed their tenure by performing a rite of purification on the entire community's behalf known as the *lustrum*. The censorship and the ritual of the *lustrum* was thought to predate the Republic: Livy 1.44.

1). These censorial notices are not simply lists, like the names of the consuls; they have grammatical structure, since after each pair of censors the letters LF stand for *lustrum fecerunt* – 'performed the *lustrum*'. The lines end with a number recording which they are in the sequence of all *lustra* – so, that performed by T. Quinctius Flamininus and M. Claudius Marcellus and recorded on line 8 of figure 1 was the 48th *lustrum* ever performed in Rome's history. The final regular pattern in the inscription is even more striking in layout: brief notices of each set of secular games (a ritual Romans believed should be celebrated once in each *saeculum*, an era defined to mean something like 'the longest possible span of human life') are inscribed not within the list or even in the margins, but on the wall outside their architectural frame (Fig. 2).[5] They proposed yet another temporal pattern, this one with cosmic implications.

To modern eyes, the years *a.u.c.* look like chapter numbers, the records of *lustra* mimic subtitles, and the notices of secular games could be marginal comments. Whatever associations they brought to mind to their original audience, they were easy to pick out by eye. The viewer could see, without reading any particular name or word, how the four patterns interact to produce the complex nature of Roman historical time.[6] The basic rhythm of yearly consulships is woven into a wider temporal tapestry stretching into the regal past. This intricate structure is expressed not only in the inscriptions' content, but also in their format and appearance.

The annual rhythm of consuls was not always smooth; there were disruptions as Rome's constitution evolved. In some years, for example, the consuls were replaced by military tribunes with consular power. Their names are recorded differently and have a different visual impact (Fig. 3). Because the number of military tribunes with consular power varied from year to year, the annual rhythm had to be marked in a different way: a horizontal line appears between years. The stonecutter has also marked them as exceptions by naming their magistracy (a practice he also followed for

[5] On the *saeculum* and its indeterminate length, see Feeney 2007 145-47.

[6] What is omitted is at least as interesting as what is included: there is no attempt to tie any of the four Roman temporal patterns into Greek or global chronography. This was a monument to Roman time, not a work of universal historiography.

censors, dictators, and *magistri equitum*): the consulship is always the default. In the years of military tribunes, the repeated annotation 'TR. MIL', for *tribuni militum*, is particularly eyecatching: it is easy to see that this was an unusual time in Rome's history.

Even once the consulship was a fully developed institution, it suffered disruptions. Sometimes a consul did not complete his year in office and was replaced by a suffect. These are clearly noted on the stone, underneath the consul they replaced, and annotations explain what happened. As a consequence, the spatial pattern of one line per year is visibly disrupted. In figure 4, under the first line is a gap: this is because in 86 BCE Marius died in office (*in magistratu mortuus est*) and in his place the suffect consul L. Valerius Flaccus was installed (*in eius locum factus est*). Flaccus' name would have been noted in the right-hand column, because Marius was junior consul. In this example, the annotations are restored, since only the left half of the stone survives. But we know the supplement must be correct, because the gap below the first line on the left half leaves room for it. In the years represented on this fragment, 86-79 BCE, plenty of consuls died or were killed. On line 5 of figure 4, we read that after his colleague was killed, Carbo finished his first consulship alone (*solus consulatum gessit*). Two lines below, without any euphemism, we are told that Gaius Marius the younger *in magistratu occisus est* – 'was killed in office'. The vocabulary pulls no punches. But the average viewer would probably be more struck by the appointment of Sulla as dictator, recorded in line 9 of figure 4. The eye is drawn to this unusual event by the way his name and that of his Magister Equitum (the dictator's second-in-command) are indented. There are plenty more irregularities, and each registers as a break in the regular temporal and visual pattern.

The triumph lists form a visual contrast to the consul lists (Fig. 5). They provide an evocative roll-call of places and peoples conquered as well as triumphing generals. The exact date of each triumph is given, starting with the wonderfully resounding triumph of Romulus on day one of year one. Visually, they do not include a great deal of variation. The accumulation of names of conquered peoples is a powerful testimony to Rome's imperial expansion and military dominance, but the overall impression is of sameness. The lettering is clear and regular, and the names are listed in a consistent

pattern, with their full filiation, their status, the year *ab urbe condita*, the place or people they conquered, and the date of the triumph. The triumph lists' pattern of accumulation and repetition is an assertion that every man listed participated in a tradition that went all the way back to Romulus.

The appearance of the consul lists is much more irregular, and viewing them side by side with the triumph lists would have brought the contrast into greater focus. The conventions chosen to list the consulships mean that times of stability and times of change can be easily spotted by eye. In periods where the annual rhythm of consulships ran smoothly, the regularity of the list is clear to see. In figure 1 the stonecutter has gone to great lengths to make the columns neat and regular. For example, in line 4 M'. Acilius Glabrio's cognomen is justified to the end of the row, providing a neat column which is pleasing to the eye. In periods of turmoil, like that recorded in figure 4, when consuls regularly die or are deposed, censors do not function, and so on, the resulting list mirrors the disruption. On such portions of the list there are breaks, multiple different levels of indentation, and empty lines where the two columns do not match up. These visual features testify to a moment when the rhythm of consulships was not running smoothly.

The consul lists were originally inscribed on four identically-shaped tablets. These four initial tablets eventually held the names of consuls down to about the year 11BCE (the very end of the fourth is lost, so we cannot be sure of the exact endpoint). And yet the consul lists as we have them now do not stop there: they were continued to cover all the years up to 13 CE. They spill over into what is sometimes called the 'fifth tablet' – in inverted commas, because it is not in fact a tablet at all. The first four tablets are set into architectural frames which clearly delineate space designed for these inscriptions. But once they were full, masons continued adding the yearly names on what had originally been the blank wall to the left of the fourth tablet.[7] On this section of the inscription there is a major change in how the years are listed. Again, the spatial layout of the tablets highlights the

[7] Some of this space had already been used for the notices of the secular games (see above). The eventual end of the list as a whole, in 13 CE, was forced by the layout: the names on the 'fifth tablet' stop when they bump into the earlier annotation for the secular games of 17 BCE. The stonemasons and their patrons simply ran out of space.

change (Fig. 6). For each year, Augustus' *tribunicia potestas* is listed, along with any other holders of that power; only then come the consuls, and then the suffects, whose names are indented. In the earlier cases, when suffect consuls were created a brief note was appended in the list, stating that the original consul had died (or been removed from the magistracy for whatever reason), and that the suffect was made consul in his place. Here, suffects are elected every year as part of a regular pattern, and their status is marked only by the indentation and the notation *ex K. Iul.* – 'from the first of July'.

On this 'fifth tablet', a very different conception of time – a very Augustan one – holds sway.[8] Dating is by years of tribunician power, with the consuls seen as secondary. The regular alternation between *consules ordinarii* and *suffecti* has become institutionalised. But the other thing noticeable on this fifth tablet is a return to regularity. The pattern is different, but it is once again a pattern. The layout is rhythmical and aesthetically pleasing, without irregular gaps and oddities. Roman viewers would have been able to make immediate ideological sense of what they saw, even if they had no interest in deciphering any particular details of the text. Stability and regularity had returned to Roman time and history – though it was a different kind of stability from the kind visible in the early consul lists.[9]

2. Honorific monuments and the role of the Senate

Nothing in the surviving inscription tells us who erected it, or when, or why.[10] To answer these questions we must consider the monument on which it was originally inscribed. Identifying the

[8] On the ordering of information on the 'fifth tablet' see Feeney 2007 180-81. In general on Augustan time and the Fasti Capitolini see Wallace-Hadrill 1987, esp. 223-4; Stiehl 1957 61-69. Augustus' takeover of Roman time also extended to the other kind of fasti, the calendars which structured the Roman civil and religious year: in addition to the items already cited, see e.g. Rüpke 2011 124-34; Barchiesi 1997 69-73.

[9] We might compare the change of format in the gallery of *summi viri*: there, great Romans of the past were monumentalized in marble, but it was decided to reward future heroes with statues in bronze. In each case, the patron chose to distinguish between past and future using a visual cue that managed to signal both continuity and change. My thanks to Wolfgang Havener for this observation.

[10] It is tempting to use letter-forms or the nomenclature used for Augustus in various places on the inscription, or to consider various dates when the names of Mark Antony and his grandfather might have been erased and subsequently reinscribed, but these considerations are ultimately inconclusive and can only be used as

monument has proven surprisingly controversial. To sum up the total archaeological evidence available before the 1990s does not take long: the fragments of the inscription were found at the eastern end of the forum, and they will not fit easily on the Regia. The only monument of which any traces survive on which they might be placed is the Augustan triple arch on the south side of the temple of Divus Julius, the base of which is still *in situ*, though under the level currently visible (Fig. 7).[11]

More recently, a series of impressive deductions by Elisabeth Nedergaard has made a positive case for attaching the inscriptions to this arch.[12] By considering not only the inscriptions themselves but also a set of architectural fragments that match them in size and decoration, she has demonstrated that they belong to a monument containing two architectural orders: a large Doric element (matching the Doric triumphal pilasters) and a smaller Corinthian addition (matching the Corinthian frames of the consular tablets). Two more pieces of corroborating evidence can help make sense of Nedergaard's reconstructions. The first is archaeological: the preserved foundations of the triple arch to the south of the temple of Divus Julius exhibit an unusual feature, in that their side pylons are noticeably smaller than the two pylons flanking the central opening. The second is numismatic: a denarius issued in 16 BCE by the moneyer Vinicius (*RIC* I 68, no. 359) shows a triple arch with side openings substantially smaller than the central opening (Fig. 8). These two pieces of evidence, alongside Nedergaard's reconstructions, would be consistent with an Augustan triple arch with a large central passageway and two smaller side corridors. All together, they produce a monument which looks like Gatti's reconstruction of the Parthian arch (Fig. 9); the key difference is that in

circumstantial evidence (usually by scholars who have already fixed on a certain date for other reasons). For fuller discussion see Stiehl 1957; Johnson 1976 138-46.

[11] The suggestion to place the Fasti on the arch was made independently by two teams: Degrassi 1945-6 and Gatti 1945-6, and Taylor 1946 and Holland 1946. Other hypotheses over the past century have included the Regia (Simpson 1993), a second, now-lost Augustan arch to the north side of the temple of Divus Julius (in various forms, Coarelli 1985 269-308; Chioffi 1996; Freyberger 2009 64-8), and the Fornix Fabianus (Steinby 1987 156-76).

[12] Nedergaard 1988a, b, 1994-5, 2001, 2004; see also Nedergaard 1993.

Nedergaard's reconstruction the Fasti are placed not in the two side openings, but in two back-to-back pairs on either side of the central pylons (Fig. 10).[13]

Nedergaard's demonstration that the Fasti belong on the triple arch in the Forum is secure, but other problems remain to be solved. Which arch was it?[14] The Parthian archers (and date) of Vinicius' coin are enough to identify the triple arch in its final state as the one voted in honour of the return of the standards from Parthia in 20 BCE.[15] This should be the arch of the Fasti.[16] But some scholars have suggested that it was originally erected to celebrate the victory at Actium in 31 BCE, and only later modified to fit the Parthian theme.[17] The Fasti Capitolini could then belong either to the original construction or to the renovation, and accordingly to either about 30-29 or about 19-18 BCE.

For my investigation, what matters is that both arches were senatorial monuments. Whether the original arch of the Fasti was Actian or Parthian, it was commissioned following a vote of the Senate, and paid for with money they allocated from the treasury.[18] The Senate, and not Augustus himself, made the decision to adorn it with lists of consuls and triumphators. The Fasti Capitolini,

[13] See below p. X.

[14] Dio mentions three arches, decreed in thanks after the battles of Naulochus in 36 BCE (49.5.1) and Actium in 31 BCE (51.19.1), and upon the return of the standards from Parthia in 20 BCE (54.8.3). The Naulochus arch was probably never built; the other two, Dio tells us, were in the Forum.

[15] As well as Vinicius' denarius from 16 BCE (Fig. 8), a set of aurei and denarii from 18-17 coined in Spain (*RIC* I 50, no. 131) show a triple arch without lower side openings, decisively identified as Parthian by its inscription CIVIS ET SIGN MILIT A PART RECVPER, while cistophori from Pergamum dated from 19-18 (*RIC* I 82, no. 508) show an entirely different single-bayed arch labelled SPR SIGNIS RECEPTIS. Which of the three shows the Parthian arch? The answer is all three; and Vinicius', minted in Rome, is the one we should trust most for architectural details. The artists of the provincial coins had never seen the Roman arch, and were working on the basis of loose verbal descriptions or even just a sense of what would be appropriate.

[16] So e.g. Nedergaard 1993 (and the other items cited above, n. 12); Itgenshorst 2004; Rose 2005; Östenberg 2009.

[17] Rich 1998; Lange 2009 136-8, 163-6 treats the implications for the Fasti.

[18] The inscription on the arch, as recorded (in abbreviated form) on Vinicius' denarius (Fig. 8), reads SPQR IMP CAE – 'the Senate and People of Rome [erected this arch in honour of] Imperator Caesar'. The People appear alongside the Senate as patrons of the arch because a popular assembly would have ratified the *senatus consultum* which proposed it. But this was an entirely ceremonial step: the popular assemblies had already been reduced to rubber-stamping exercises. No changes would have been made to the text of the decree or the details of the honours awarded. The symbolic approval of the people was important (*senatus consulta* were already treated as if they had the force of law at this date, so the choice to submit the decree for ratification was deliberate) but the Senate alone made the decision to honour Augustus in this particular way. In general on the relation between imperial *senatus consulta*, laws, and honours see Rowe 2002 64-6; Millar 1988 12-13 (on the Tabula Siarensis: 'the Senate could now act as if the consent of the *populus* could be assumed in advance').

therefore, should be understood not only in the context of the Augustan transformation of Rome, but also as part of the new genre of honorific monuments commissioned by the Senate for the *princeps*.

All the arches voted by the Senate during the triumviral and Augustan period were honours for Augustus. They fall at the very beginning of a pattern we know well from the accounts of Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio, and even from epigraphically-preserved decrees.[19] The Senate of the imperial period spent significant amounts of time, energy, and money on monuments and other honours given to the *princeps*. In the literary accounts (which mostly concern later reigns) these debates and the resulting decrees and monuments served multiple purposes. One of their most obvious functions was to underscore the Senate's subservience and loyalty. But the relationships they built and sustained were not merely an inflexible hierarchy with the emperor at the top. Senators could use debates as vehicles for internal competition, vying to propose the most eye-catching addition to the overall package of honours and thus earn imperial favour. Adding impressive new monuments to the cityscape served as a way for the Senate to demonstrate its own importance to the people. Most importantly for this paper, the decrees and resulting honours were a way for the Senate to claim a measure of control in articulating their relationship with the *princeps*. They reminded him not just of their loyalty, but of the importance of their loyalty. Even the form of words chosen for a decree, or the decoration of a monument, could send a message: to honour someone for (say) their clemency can be read as an instruction to continue being clement in the future, or even a threat that further honours and support depend on continued clemency. Both sides of the exchange used the process as one way of negotiating their relationship with the other.[20]

Suetonius' account of the debate on the death of Augustus (Suet. *Aug.* 100), for example, takes the form of a list of individual proposals, with senators competing with each other to add

[19] E.g. Tac. *Ann*. 2.32, 3.57, and (most pointedly) 3.65; Suet. *Aug*. 100; Dio 54.25.3, 56.47.1.
[20] This process has been analysed in more detail by Rowe 2002 59-66 and *passim*; Roller 2001 173-212; Lendon 1997 107-74. On the function of works of art and architecture commissioned by the Senate, see especially Mayer 2010; Stewart 2008 108-116.

something to the overall package.[21] In this episode, at the end of Augustus' life, it is clear that a relatively well-developed system for generating honours had already evolved. Individual senators made suggestions which, cumulatively, were included the final decree; the *princeps* would then accept or reject elements individually. The *Tabula Siarensis*, a decree passed under Tiberius, confirms the general picture: a variety of honours are proposed, and the *princeps* is asked to decide which he would like to accept. The proposed honours include an honorific arch, and its decoration is described in some detail. These particulars, including a precise list of individuals to be represented in sculptural form on top of the arch, the text of the inscription, details of the materials to be used, and the exact location, would have emerged from the kind of debate Suetonius depicts, in which each individual senator wanted to make his own contribution and 'cap' all those who had come before him. We can imagine that each detail was the proposal of a different senator.[22]

The process of proposing a package of honours was not one-sided and certainly not under the direct control of the *princeps* in all its stages. It would not be unusual for him to be thousands of miles away from the Senate as they deliberated in Rome. He had the final say, and might refuse any or all of the honours decreed; indeed, refusing honours gradually became institutionalised as a part of the emperor's modesty and *civilitas*.[23] Still, he did not have a completely free hand. Ostentatiously refusing too many honours could be seen as just as arrogant and out-of-touch as accepting too many. The emperor also had to avoid refusing individual proposals which were close to the heart of some particularly important ally or constituency. After Livia's death the Senate voted an arch in her honour. Tiberius did not wish to see his mother memorialized in this way, but rather than simply refusing the arch (and therefore, presumably, alienating those who revered Livia) he employed a complicated strategy to make sure the arch was never built.[24] The example of the arch for Livia also demonstrates

[21] Cf. Tac. *Ann*. 1.8; Dio 54.47.1.
[22] *T.Siar.* = Crawford 1996 37; the details of the arch are in lines 9-21. For full discussion of the inscription, see Rowe 2002.
[23] For *civilitas* as an imperial virtue, see Wallace-Hadrill 1982.
[24] Dio 58.2: he adopted the less drastic expedient of refusing to accept any public money and stating that he would build the arch himself (presumably a decision he could spin as an act of *pietas*) but never actually followed through.

that we should not imagine the process of proposing honours was simply an empty charade orchestrated by secret messages behind the scenes. In this case, the Senate voted an arch which the *princeps* decidedly did not want. He would have preferred that it had never been mentioned.

A final twist in the process is that the honorific decrees which the Senate passed still stood as monuments even if the honours themselves were eventually refused. I use the word 'monuments' advisedly: they were engraved on bronze, set up in prominent positions in Rome, and speedily circulated to the provinces.[25] These inscriptions included all the honours, whether accepted or refused. The decrees also became part of the senatorial archive. As a result, historians (and here Dio is the prime example) are well informed about honours which were voted – and, indeed, rather less well informed about whether or not they were accepted or ever carried through.[26] He or his sources are relying on published *senatus consulta*.

It is only by chance (and Tacitean animus) that we have so many details of the negotiation process for the reign of Tiberius, but the guiding assumptions on both sides must already have been laid down under Augustus – or rather, were still in the process of being laid down. For the relationship between Senate and *princeps*, and for the process of exchange made tangible in honorific monuments, the Augustan period must have been a time of intense experimentation. We see the results in the novel, experimental forms of the monuments themselves: the monumental altar of the Ara Pacis, the

[25] Rose 2005 23 has argued that the specific decree that resulted in the Parthian Arch was circulated speedily to the provinces. He cites as evidence coins that appeared both in Spain and in Pergamum very soon after the honour of an arch was voted. Tellingly, they differ in detail from the coin of Vinicius, which does appear to be based on actual familiarity with the arch (see above, n.15). All three, however, could easily have been derived from a written description of a triple arch, to be surmounted with a statue of Augustus in triumph, decorated with statues of defeated Parthians, and so on – exactly the kind of detail we would expect from the *senatus consultum*.

[26] Note the Naulochus arch, above, n.14: Dio lists the honours voted, and at 49.15.3 notes that Octavian refused some of them; Appian *B.C.* 5.130 lists the honours he accepted, and the arch is not among them. See Rich 1998 106 for further discussion. Compare Dio 51.19-20: the historian gives full details of all the honours voted, saying that these things were decided (ἐγνώσθη), and then goes on to add without much specificity that all but a few were accepted. For the only refused item he actually names (a proposal that the whole population should meet the *princeps* on his return to the city), he is clear that Augustus explicitly begged (παρῃτήσατο ἄντικρυς) that it not be carried out – perhaps an indication that Dio had access to the text of a particular speech of refusal?

new style of triple arch, the innovation of gilded letters in inscriptions.[27] These were the product of many minds, together and in competition, rather than a steady evolution guided by the *princep*s' hand alone.

As Andrew Wallace-Hadrill has shown, the entire system of honorific monuments was a new development of the Augustan period.[28] In particular, the role of the Senate drastically changed. During the Republic, individual wealthy men (almost always senators, of course) took the initiative in most of Rome's grandiose new building projects. The Republican Senate sometimes granted these men permission to erect their monuments, but they never built in their own right as a corporate body. Their relationship with the city was structured by competition rather than cooperation. Under Augustus, everything changed. Individual senators, whether acting as triumphant generals or as censors, could no longer compete with the *princeps* and his unlimited resources.[29] As a group, on the other hand, the Senate had access both to a position of traditional authority and to the riches of the treasury.

When the Senate started to vote honorific monuments, there were no rules or guiding principles yet available, and Augustus did not propose any. Instead, the negotiation proceeded in fits and starts, as the *princeps* signalled his pleasure or displeasure by accepting or refusing what was proposed. Each proposal was a shot in the dark. Individual senators and the Senate itself were desperately trying to find their place in the new regime; Augustus had no desire to rule them with a rod of iron.[30]

[27] On the impact of gilded letters, see esp. Alföldy 1991 298-9.
[28] Wallace-Hadrill 1990.
[29] Eck 2010 tracks how individual patrons outside the imperial family were gradually pushed out of public space.
[30] Plenty has been written on the role of the senatorial elite in the Augustan regime. Syme 1939 remains vital. On the institutional role of the Senate in particular, see Brunt 1984; Talbert 1984; Russell (forthcoming). The developments in senators' religious roles analysed by Varhelyi 2010 provide further examples of both individual members of the elite and the Senate as a group searching for new ways to understand and express their place in the new regime.

Whether we want to date the Fasti to the early 20s or the early teens, they were an innovation coming at the very beginning of the development of the Senate's role as patron of monuments, and more generally of the system of imperial honours. The Senate (or individual senators) was as much the driving force as the *princeps* himself. The focus of the rest of this paper will be to ask how an appreciation of the Senate's role in erecting the Fasti should affect our understanding of their purpose, and in particular of the conception of history they present. Numerous scholars have created sophisticated interpretations of this monument which bring together Augustus' interest in calendars and the control of time, his antiquarianism, the idea of Augustus as the culmination of all past consuls and triumphators, and much more.[31] If we can be sure that they are connected to the Parthian arch and therefore date them to some time around 19 BCE, we can be even more specific: at this time Augustus was concerned with the promotion of the old nobility and emphasis on the consulship, especially after he himself vacated it in 23.[32] In 19 itself, he had acquired some kind of perpetual consular status: Dio's narrative is hard to interpret, but we are told that he sat on a curule chair between the two consuls and was entitled to consular insignia.[33] Recovering the standards from the Parthians could be presented as the defeat of Rome's last remaining enemy, making Augustus the ultimate triumphator as well as the ultimate consul.[34] There are also tantalizing links to the closely contemporary Secular Games, their concern with cycles of time and their suggestion of the end of history. The Fasti, then, make perfect sense in the context of Augustan ideology more broadly.

The traditional, 'Augustan' interpretations of the Fasti are entirely convincing. But if we take seriously the fact that this was a senatorial monument, it becomes possible to provide new readings which shed light not only on Augustus, but also on the Senate and its role in the new system. This Fasti belong to the mindset of the Age of Augustus but have their own particular genesis and inspiration. The concerns and attitudes that lie behind them were not necessarily the same as those

[31] See esp. Feeney 2007 172-82; Stiehl 1957 61-69; Wallace-Hadrill 1987 223-7.
[32] Noted by Taylor 1946 7.
[33] Dio 54.10.5.
[34] Östenberg 2009 has an excellent treatment of the Fasti Triumphales and Parthian Arch as a central plank of Augustus' new ideological repertoire of peace; cf. Rose 2005;Rich 1998; Schäfer 1998; Chioffi 1996 45-7; and for a different perspective see Havener in this volume.

behind, say, the Forum of Augustus. Their approach to the past (and present, and future) is senatorial at least as much as it is Augustan.

3. Antiquarianism, anxiety, and the Golden Age

The Fasti Capitolini do not stand alone. If we detach them from the broader 'Augustan programme', whatever that may be, they can find other contexts. One clear link is with what Rawson categorises as a second wave of antiquarianism, a trend which stretches across the first centuries BCE and CE, the Late Republic as well as the early Empire.[35] The compilers of the Fasti could take advantage of the recent boom in antiquarian scholarship: the new lists depended on the same process of research which also produced such works as Atticus' chronology, or the investigations of historians like Licinius Macer in the *libri lintei*. In broad strokes, it is possible to interpret them in the same way as the rest of that tradition. The impulse to look to the past was prompted by anxiety about change in the present.[36] Jörg Rüpke has pointed to elite anxieties around the decline of the consulship already in the second century BCE as a factor behind the rise of consul-lists as a phenomenon.[37] In the early principate, the nature and status of the consulship changed much more profoundly; anxiety was correspondingly stronger. It was precisely the 'Republican' institution of the Senate and its members who must have felt that anxiety most keenly, and who decided to respond by a celebration, a defiant reaffirmation even, of the continuity of a tradition of consulships and triumphs which stretched right back to Rome's early history.

Nedergaard's new reconstructions show that consular tablets two and three, covering a period from roughly 390 to 154 BC, were given the most prominent position. They stood in the central

[35] Rawson 1972 35.
[36] Rawson 1972 35; cf. Wallace-Hadrill 2005, esp. 65-7; Moatti 1997, esp. 143-55; and with specific reference to monumentalization and the epigraphic habit, Woolf 1996.
[37] Rüpke 2011 125.

opening of the arch, flanked by the triumphal pilasters (Fig. 10).[38] More recent consuls, including Augustus himself, were relegated to a side opening; so were the heroes of the early Republic. This would be a poor design choice if the sole aim of the Fasti were for Augustus to portray himself as the culmination of the list, or to eclipse the past. Augustus' Golden Age was positioned somewhere between the remote Saturnian past and the tantalising future envisaged by the poets. The Fasti Capitolini propose a different (though equally mythical) Golden Age: the middle Republic. It was in this period that the great Roman noble names had first acquired the dignity that kept their representatives in the last decades of the first century BCE near, if no longer exactly at, the top of the social pyramid. The senators were following in the footsteps of their own fathers and grandfathers: people like Cicero, who as the Republic was crumbling longed not for a return to the distant past or the dawn of a new era, but for the more recent incarnation of perfect government, senatorial *auctoritas*, and elite consensus celebrated in the *de Republica*. For the *dramatis personae* of Cicero's dialogue, that Golden Age had already passed.[39] But it was the age of Camillus and the Cunctator, of Scipio Africanus and Aemilius Paullus. This last worthy was commemorated on the nearby Fornix Fabianus, a monument to a great senatorial family and their achievements.[40] The new arch inscribed itself in that historical tradition as well as in the new honorific, imperial mould.

4. Exemplarity and the viewing process

At the same time as the Fasti Capitolini were first inscribed (or at most a decade later), Augustus himself commissioned a monument which set out its own distinctive approach to history and memory.

[38] The third tablet of the consul lists was found *in situ*, flanked by the first and second triumphal pilasters (Fig. 2). Nedergaard 2004 demonstrates that the heights of each course of its blocks match the heights of the blocks holding the fourth consular tablet (and the so-called 'fifth tablet' on the wall next to it). Similarly, the first and second consular tablets and the third and fourth triumphal pilasters belong together: their measurements are the same, but different from those of the unit containing the third and fourth consular tablets. What is more, the large Doric triumphal pilasters must belong in the larger central opening of the arch.

[39] *Rep*. 5.1-2 locates this age in the past with respect to Cicero himself; but at 1.31 his characters (the dramatic date of the dialogue is 129 BCE) already imagine it as in the past, and particularly in the pre-Gracchan era. The surviving parts of Scipio's historical narrative in Book 2 give a story of gradual improvement in the form of the constitution; presumably the lost sections contained an indication of when the tide turned, at some point between the Struggle of the Orders and Scipio's own time.

[40] *CIL* I^2 763. On the Fornix, see further Chioffi 1995, with references.

The gallery of *summi viri* which lined his new Forum of Augustus, begun in 20 BCE, proposed their own monumental narrative of Rome's glorious past.[41] With their *elogia* giving viewers key details about the honorees' successes and achievements, Augustus' gallery of heroes instantiated a historical paradigm based around exemplarity and moral improvement.[42] We know this exemplary mode of history from Livy, and Suetonius tells us that Augustus was an enthusiast: he would seek out edifying anecdotes in the historians he read, copy them out, and send them to his family or subordinates as explicit moral instructions.[43] The *summi viri* took his habit to a monumental level. Suetonius quotes his own words:

> *proximum a dis immortalibus honorem memoriae ducum praestitit, qui imperium p. R. ex minimo maximum reddidissent. itaque… statuas omnium triumphali effigie in utraque fori sui porticu dedicavit, professus et edicto: commentum id se, ut ad illorum vitam velut ad exemplar et ipse, dum viveret, et insequentium aetatium principes exigerentur a civibus.*
> Next to the immortal Gods he honoured the memory of the leaders who had raised the estate of the Roman people from obscurity to greatness. Accordingly... in the colonnades of his forum he dedicated statues of all of them in triumphal garb, declaring besides in a proclamation: "I have contrived this to lead the citizens to require me, while I live, and the rulers of later times as well, to attain the standard set by these worthies of old."

With his *summi viri*, Augustus positioned himself as both audience and author – and also as an authority on how to understand history. He adopted the exemplary mode of history as his own.

The Fasti Capitolini have their place in a paradigm that looks to the past for the sake of the future, presenting Roman history in monumentalised form to inspire the present. Yet there are aspects of the Fasti which are hard to fit into an exemplary mould. The exemplary historical tradition monumentalised in stone by the gallery of *summi viri* is based around principles of selectivity and

[41] The scholarship on the new Forum and its sculpture is immense; see in particular Shaya 2013; Geiger 2008; Spannagel 1999; Zanker 1988 210-15.
[42] The role of exemplarity and the concept of history found in the Forum of Augustus is well discussed by Gowing 2005 138-45; more generally on exemplarity, see now Roller 2018.
[43] Suet. *Aug*. 89.2.

experience. In Augustus' forum, a single guiding authority has selected examples – exclusively glorious ones – for imitation. The Fasti, on the other hand, are comprehensive rather than selective. The names of men who made little contribution, and even the great villains of Roman history, are listed on the Fasti alongside the heroes. There is no way for the viewer to distinguish between them, no annotations along the line of the *elogia*.

The Fasti show the bad times alongside the good. As suggested earlier (and in stark contrast to their treatment of individuals), at the scale of entire decades or periods they make it remarkably easy to pick out times of turmoil when the regular rhythm of consulships faltered. And the disruptions were not safely confined to the distant past of the decemvirate or the military tribunes with consular power; for the Fasti's original audience, the civil war was a living memory. It must have been striking to see recent bad memories so prominently monumentalized. The lines of the inscription relating to the 40s and 30s BCE have not been preserved, but that period's tumult and disorder must have been clearly visible in the way the names were set out on the stone. There were also plenty of recent villains: modern scholars may argue over when and why Antony's name was erased and then reinscribed, but the mason has done his job well. The erasure and reinscription does not stand out to the eye.

The Roman exemplary tradition – though not the version selected by Augustus for his gallery of *summi viri* – had room for the bad as well as the good: negative *exempla* could be as instructive as positive ones. Livy is clear that his readers should be able to select examples to avoid as well as examples to follow.[44] But the Fasti go even further. As well as the good and the bad, they include a category the exemplary tradition excludes entirely: the mediocre. Paullus and Africanus, Caesar and Antony, are listed right alongside hundreds of men whose names have otherwise disappeared from history. They even share space with such names as the famously unworthy suffect consuls Ventidius and Carrinas, ridiculed by Cicero for holding office for only a few days (or in Carrinas' case, only

[44] Liv. 1.*praef.*10.

one).[45] By appointing them, Augustus' adoptive father Caesar had brought the entire institution of the consulship into disrepute. These names were not the kind of larger-than-life heroes or villains of which *exempla* are made. They would not have prompted a Roman viewer's pride or excited his emulation. Augustus, for one, might have been glad to forget them.[46]

Our best source for the Roman exemplary tradition more widely is Livy. In his preface, the historian gives a remarkably full explanation of how his audience should understand and relate to history as a store-cupboard of *exempla*. Unlike Augustus, who took control of which positive *exempla* would be represented in his Forum, Livy asks the reader to make his or her own selections of examples to imitate and avoid from the rich tapestry of Roman history.[47] But the Fasti Capitolini do not allow for this kind of selectivity either. To make selections Livy's reader needs the information the author gives about the characters' deeds, characters, successes and failures. The Fasti, and in particular the consul lists, give no such information. All the viewer knows is that these men were consuls. Perhaps that is information enough: they were successful individuals, and the viewer might be inspired to strive to earn his place among them. Yet such an interpretation already introduces a significant change into the personal relationship between text and audience which Romans expected from the exemplary tradition.

Latin authors explain the moral value of exemplary history as depending on a personal and experiential connection with the historical figure. The reader is inspired to imitate heroes from the past who catch his or her imagination. History, they claim, needs to be exciting to provide a moral benefit, and list of names are almost proverbially uninteresting. Cicero writes to the historian Lucceius begging him to write an interesting history: *etenim ordo ipse annalium mediocriter nos retinet, quasi enumeratione fastorum* – 'because the very genre of annals barely holds our attention, like reading out fasti' (*Fam.* 5.12.5); and at *de Finibus* 5.71 he makes Piso say that the excitement of

[45] Ventidius: Macr. *Sat.* 2.3.5; Caninius: Cic. *Fam.* 7.30.1.
[46] Cf. Eder 1990 72: 'The *Res Gestae* shows almost a complete blank between Philippi and Actium'; and see Gowing 2005 142-5 on the selectiveness of the gallery of *summi viri*.
[47] Liv. 1.*praef.*10.

history comes from learning small details about the figures you admire. The final stage of the argument is laid out in a maxim of Sempronius Asellio preserved by Gellius: *neque alacriores, inquit, ad rem p. defendundam, neque segniores ad rem purpuram faciundum annales libri commovere quosquam possunt* – 'books of annals, says Asellio, cannot make anyone keener to defend the *res publica*, nor slower to do wrong' (Gell. 5.18.8-9). Readers of history were looking for an exciting story complete with engaging details and anecdotes. Only this kind of history, which led them to an emotional identification with the figures depicted, could guide them to imitate their virtues.[48]

For most members of their original audience, the Fasti Capitolini did not offer any kind of individual identification or inspiration. Perhaps a viewer with consular ancestors or extraordinarily detailed historical knowledge, someone seeking only to reactivate a previously-existing emotional connection with a historical figure, could search through painstakingly for a particular name – though the small letters, some set high on the wall, would have proved an obstacle for anyone without perfect eyesight, and any history buff poring over the names in the arch's narrow gangways would have been blocking traffic. To viewers without such a specific goal in mind, the overall impression, then as now, was not one of individual exemplary figures but of massed ranks of undifferentiated names.

The Fasti Capitolini, impressive but ultimately impersonal, represent a different conception of history to the one we find in the exemplary history of Livy or the Forum of Augustus. They make no selections of examples to imitate or avoid, and do not give viewers the necessary information to make their own. They do not offer a personal, inspirational experience of particular moments in Roman history; instead, they awe their audience with a large-scale statement about the grandeur of Roman history in general. They say far less about the history they ostensibly preserve than about the act of preserving it. Rather than telling individual stories, they tell us that history as a whole exists and can be known. And rather than address the viewer as consumer of history, they make a claim about the Senate, its patrons, as the guardians and producers of memory. The next two sections will examine

[48] The same applies to the *summi viri* statues: note Gowing 2005 140, on their *enargeia*, and Shaya 2013 92-3 on their readability.

what it meant to preserve history in this way, and how doing so allowed the Senate to assert its own authority.

5. Epigraphic lists and epistemology

The Fast Capitolini lists were not much use to individual members of the audience in search of historical information. This brings us to a fundamental question: why was such information gathered and inscribed, if not to be used? Romans kept lists of consuls, of triumphs, of priests, of sacrifices, of prodigies, of grain shortages, and plenty more.[49] All of these forms of records are generally mentioned in passing by texts of both Republican and imperial date. The authors who discuss them, however, tend to be talking about their existence, rather than using them as sources of information.[50] Modern scholars of ancient history, trained to value sources above all else, find this hard to fathom, and as a result many of the misconceptions and confusions surrounding these early forms of records and archives begin from our natural, but incorrect, assumption that such lists are basically intended as tools for historians.

The insight that ancient lists should not be understood as 'sources' is most cogently expressed in Bruce Frier's work on the *Annales Maximi*.[51] Frier suggests that instead of, or as well as, serving as repositories of information to be checked later, these records have an epistemological importance. One example is the list of prodigies collected by the *pontifex maximus*: it is the act of inscription on

[49] E.g. Cato *ap*. Gell. 2.28.6: *non lubet scribere quod in tabula apud pontificem maximum est, quotiens annona cara, quotiens lunae aut solis lumine caligo aut quid obstiterit*. For the Augustan period, the records of sacrifices performed by the Fratres Arvales offer a good parallel: Scheid 1990. The papers in *La mémoire perdue. Recherches sur l'administration romaine* 1998 cover a wide variety of different kinds of record-keeping.
[50] Certainly some historians did make use of documentary evidence, but it was not the norm. Livy (4.7.11; 4.13.7; 4.20.8; 4.23.1) mentions the *libri lintei* primarily to point out that Licinius Macer cited them, and not to cite them himself. Once the information they contained had entered the literary tradition, few historians saw any need to return to the source itself. So e.g. Ogilvie 1997 13: 'the very different general attitude to research is shown by a tendency amongst ancient historians to base their accounts of earlier history on previous narratives'.
[51] Frier 1999, a work of great importance even if it does not clear up all the questions these frustrating items (I cannot even with confidence call them 'texts') raise.

the list which determines whether or not a particular unusual event is or is not a prodigy.[52] In Cicero's world, consul lists have a similar function. There were a variety of rituals and events by which someone was made a consul. But when Cicero uses the word *fasti* to mean consul lists, he uses it as another marker of the fact that someone is indeed a true consul. At *pro Sestio* 33, he claims that it would hardly be right to call Piso and Octavius consuls; their names should be erased not only from memory but even from the fasti. The same concept recurs at *in Pisonem* 30: again, it is not just *animi hominum* – 'the minds of men' – but even *fasti ulli* – 'any fasti' – which should refuse to recognise them as consuls.

These passages do not imply the existence, in Cicero's time or later, of a single authoritative master list of consuls which could be consulted to settle the question of whether a certain name was or was not in the fasti. Historians were still arguing over the details, politicians could accuse each other of inventing ancestral consulships, and among Cicero's more scholarly friends there were various ongoing debates in play.[53] But Cicero's usages do suggest that consul lists had an epistemological role: the fact that a man's name was recorded in the fasti was one of the things that made him a consul.[54]

For Cicero, it was enough that the fasti had a notional existence. Epigraphic consul lists did exist in his time, possibly even including one in the temple of Hercules Musarum that had been there for more than a hundred years, but he never thinks to check them.[55] Cicero did not have access to any

[52] Frier 1999 95; on writing itself as constitutive of knowledge in Roman record-keeping practice, see also Rodriguez-Mayorgos 2007; and on the epistemological power of public display of texts, Corbier 2013 23-4.
[53] Cic. *Brut*. 62 (his remark implies that the truth was knowable, but not widely known); cf. Liv. 8.40.4-5 on exaggeration in funeral *laudationes*, and Liv. 4.7.11, 4.20.8, 4.23.1, on discrepancies between the standard lists and those Licinius Macer claimed to have found in the Libri Lintei.
[54] At *Att*. 4.8a.2, he uses this meaning of the word to make a joke: writing in 56, he comments on the so-called triumvir's attempts to sew up future elections by stating that Pompey has fasti of future consuls at least as long as the list of consuls that have already been.
[55] The single preserved example of a Republican consul list (the *Fasti Antiates Maiores*, from the town of Antium some 50 km south of Rome) dates from the 60s or 50s BCE. Many more have been hypothesised, including a list set up in the 170s in the temple of Hercules Musarum in Rome. We know that its patron, Fulvius Nobilior, set up a calendar there: Macr. *Sat*. 1.12.16. Such calendars were also known as *fasti*, and they often

consul list so public, so formal, so official as the Fasti Capitolini. They were the first to be set up in the Forum by public decree and backed by senatorial authority. But even once the Fasti Capitolini existed, the list they preserved did not become understood as authoritative, at least not for the distant past.[56] Debates continued, and we have no attestation of any historian or other member of the public consulting the lists for a definitive answer.[57]

Even if they never intended them to be consulted, the Senate made a range of epistemological claims by publishing consul (and triumph) lists in such a public, monumental form. The new lists did not settle debates about, say, the precise *cognomina* of various fourth-century consuls, but they did engage with them. What is more, by listing consuls, they listed families who could claim consular status. In a world where only one man could aspire to supreme authority, powerful anxieties surrounded the role of the nobility and social mobility. Caesar and Octavian had both made the boundaries of Rome's highest status group a little more fluid by mass promotions to the Senate and allocations of consulships to their own supporters; more recently, the frequent use of *consules suffecti* as well as *ordinarii* could also be seen as threatening consular exclusivity.[58] Even if the precise details were not considered authoritative, publishing a list of consuls asserted that the boundaries existed and mattered.

---

appear together with fasti in the sense of consul lists. See further Rüpke 1995a; Rüpke 2006; Rüpke 2011, esp. 100-1.

[56] Taylor 1946, 8-9; 1951 75 points out that Livy and the Fasti Capitolini often differ – and that although after his first decade the absolute discrepancies subside, this is probably because there was general agreement on the names of consuls of more recent periods rather than because the historian consulted the newly-erected inscription. Discrepancies in reporting which consul was senior and which was junior continue at the same rate in the third and fourth decade, published well after both suggested dates for the Fasti Capitolini. Even Dionysius, who Taylor believed did use the Fasti Capitolini (or at least a version of the list from which they were copied; he never actually mentions the inscription) as a source, records a different senior/junior order for 452, and there are further discrepancies regarding the suffects of 463 and 453, the decemviri, and overall chronology: Taylor 1951 79 n.19. Above and beyond the details of any individual consulship, however, the AUC dates on the Fasti imply that Rome was founded in 752 BCE, rather than the more widely accepted Varronian 753; Dionysius' discussion of chronology at 1.74-5 makes no mention of the Fasti's date or Varro's and settles on 751.

[57] When Livy says *paginas in annalisbus magistratuumque fastis percurrere licet* (9.18.12), or Seneca offers *ad fastus te et annales perducam publicos* (*Dial*. 11.14), this is surely a metaphor, along the same lines as Cicero's notional consul lists.

[58] Discussion in Hurlet 2011 325, 333-4.

The Fasti also responded to and took a position in an ongoing debate about Rome's magistracies and traditions. Traces of an antiquarian tradition preserved in our literary sources suggest that Roman scholars of the late Republic and early principate were asking some of the same questions as modern scholars about the development of Rome's political institutions.[59] Was the consulship really invented in 509 BCE? Why do some texts call Rome's early chief magistrate a praetor? Vast, confident, and (for the most part) regular, the consul lists asserted that the Roman Republic had been based on consular power from the start. This was their strongest historical claim, visible at a single glance to any viewer. Antiquarians might quibble about the fine details of individual names and dates, but the importance of consuls in Rome's history was clear.

6. The Senate as a body and collective identity formation

The Fasti Capitolini was not the first monument to use consul lists as part of a new historical paradigm. In the volume to which this is a sequel, Ingo Gildenhard considers some ramifications of Rüpke's work on fasti, and proposes that the consul lists which probably stood in the temple of Hercules Musarum should be seen as an attempt to create a new kind of public history that was less fragmented and more communal.[60] The Fasti Capitolini build on their model, but take it to an extreme. We have few details about Fulvius Nobilior's fasti, but if they were anything like the other, later Republican fasti of which we have very small fragments, they were much less universal than the Fasti Capitolini. The partially surviving Fasti Antiates Maiores, set up in the 60s or 50s BCE, are substantially less detailed (missing full filiations, for example); they do not include the same contextualising information, like notes of major wars; most importantly, they seem to have made no claim to cover they whole of Roman history, beginning probably in the 170s.[61] The Fasti Capitolini

[59] See Smith 2011, esp. 34-39; Urso 2011; Urso 2005.
[60]Gildenhard 2003; Rüpke 1995a; Rüpke 2006; Rüpke 2011, esp. 346-52.
[61] Discussion in Stiehl 1957 45-8; Rüpke 1995b 43-44 (not represented in the revised English edition, Rüpke 2011) and 346-52 (=Rüpke 2011 96-99). For the beginning date of the Fasti Antiates see Rüpke 1995a 201, where he argues that they probably follow Nobilior's; Rüpke 2006 509 emends his earlier position slightly to argue that Nobilior's lists did extend some distance into the past, but they cannot have reached all the way to the

proudly reach right back to the beginning. And although earlier fasti too were displayed in public, it was a quantum leap in publicity when the Senate of Rome decreed that these inscriptions should be placed on an arch in the Forum Romanum itself.

The Fasti Capitolini, and the arch on which they stood, were a monument among monuments. They were, however, a monument of a very different kind to the nearby Fornix Fabianus, to take one example. They do not fit well into the tradition of memorialization we see in the late Republic, when putting your family's name on a large building was an end in itself – and a move in a zero-sum competition to expand one's own place in history at the expense of other members of the elite.[62] Rather, they are a collective monument. They do not assert the memory of an individual, but claim a place for the Senate as a whole in Rome's central space. In erecting them, the Senate was acting as a group. Even the process of compiling them must have involved bringing a range of family histories and archives together. This is epigraphy as identity definition, but made communal.[63]

During the Augustan period, the Senate was evolving a new identity as a group, rather than a collection of individuals in competition with each other.[64] In their new corporate role, they were able to formulate a response to the Republican view of history which Ingo Gildenhard describes in the introduction to this volume as only selectively annalistic, and characterised by fragmented storage, polycentric historical agency, and ephemeral enactment in public space.[65] The Fasti Capitolini are exactly the opposite of what Gildenhard describes: they display in permanent and monumental form all of Roman history, brought together and certified by decree.[66] It is almost a paradox that a fully-

---

beginning of the Republic, since such detailed antiquarian knowledge simply was not available in the 170s; see further Rüpke 2011 101.

[62] On monumentalization and memorialization, and the consequences for a fragmented and family-based Republican concept of history, see especially Meadows/Williams 2001 40-44.

[63] On epigraphy as identity definition, see especially Woolf 1996.

[64] The rise of the Senate as a corporate body and the *Ordo Senatorius* is discussed by, *inter alia*, Chastignol 1973;Nicolet 1976; Brunt 1984; Talbert 1984; Varhelyi 2010.

[65] p. X.

[66] Republican consul-lists were of course partial precedents, but never aspired to the same level of universailty or official status; see the discussion above. For historiography itself as a unifying practice, replacing individual family stories with the tales of the *res publica*, see Beck 2003; Gildenhard 2003. Heslin 2015 206-7 has an

developed concept of Republican, annalistic history, stretching in unbroken sequence back to Brutus and forwards into a glorious future, was in fact not Republican at all. Though later generations would think of this annalistic mode of history as constitutive of the Republic and representative of a Republican, consular system, its true flowering was only possible under Augustus, when the fractious Roman elite found a new unity of identity if not of purpose.

The imperial Senate were the descendants (literal or spiritual) of the great consuls of the second, third, and fourth centuries BCE whose names adorned the lists placed prominently in the central opening of the arch they erected to honour Augustus. They were proof of continuity between Republic and empire, and they would go on to fulfil an important role as the only body which could provide continuity between the reigns of individual emperors, and legitimacy to the new successor. They were living representatives of the *mos maiorum*, guardians of Rome's memory and traditions. By erecting the Fasti so publically and officially, they did not necessarily close down all debate about who exactly was senior or junior consul in a certain year; what they did, though, was assert that Rome's history existed and could be known, and that they themselves (aided, of course, by the tacit consent of the People) were its logical arbiters.[67]

The Senate's role as guardians of history naturally extended into the present and future: they, and not the *princeps*, had the power to decide how the heroes of the present would be remembered. Horace's attitude to fasti brings out the point. At *Odes* 3.17.4, published in 23 BCE, he he tells Lamia that his family name is found in the *memores fasti*, the fasti which remember. Here he is probably

excellent discussion of how fasti, centred around names, represent a different mode of collective history from that championed by Cato's *Origines*, in which the *populus Romanus* was the hero and individuals were not named, but identified as 'the consul', 'the dictator', etc. In the Fasti Capitolini, a collective mode of history won out – but one still focused on elite prestige.

[67] Wallace-Hadrill 2005 points out that the antiquarian trends of the first century BCE had seen the nobility (and in particular family traditions) replaced as authorities on Rome's history and memory by new appeals to scholarly method – though of course most of the scholars were nobles themselves. By coopting the advances made by antiquarians and presenting them in this new form, the Senate was revitalizing the traditional role of the nobility in a newly institutionalized manner.

imagining the same kind of notional consul lists from which Cicero wanted to exclude Piso. But in book 4, from the year 13 BCE, he refers to a more official version and the people behind it:

> *quae cura patrum quaeve Quiritium*
> *plenis honorum muneribus tuas,*
> *Auguste, virtutes in aevum*
> *per titulos memoresque fastus*
> *aeternet?*
> 'What care will the senators, and what the citizens, take to immortalize for all time your successes, Augustus, with full trappings of honour, through inscriptions and the fasti which remember?' (Horace, *Odes* 4.14.1-5)

For Horace, Augustus' glory is not in question; the only debate is whether the Senate and People will be able to devise adequate honours to recognise it fully. But even here, they are given a measure of agency: it is the Senate and the People (so, in practice, the Senate) who have control of the Fasti and the memory they represent.[68]

In the context of the entire arch, crowned as was by a massive statue of Augustus in a quadriga and primarily dedicated to inscribing his deeds in Rome's landscape and collective memory, the Fasti might seem like an afterthought. It is likely that most visitors marvelled at the arch's size and elaborate, costly decoration, and thought only of Augustus and his glorious victories. Still, the inscriptions add crucial nuance to the picture. They make a point about the consulship, and a point about history. The election of yearly consuls was vital to Augustus' own conception of his principate: he wanted to be able to say in all truth that his *res publica* preserved all the traditions of Rome's ancestors.[69] He needed the Senate (and the elite more broadly) to provide new officeholders each year. At the same time, to uphold their own sense of purpose, the Senate needed Augustus to acknowledge how much he needed them. By accepting the honour of having the Fasti inscribed on his new

[68] Horace is probably referring here to *fasti* in both senses: as a prolific patron of temples, Augustus also had his name inserted many times into calendrical fasti which recorded those anniversaries as well as lists of magistrates.
[69] On the consulship under Augustus, see Hurlet 2011.

monument, Augustus tacitly accepted their claim. On the arch, he stands literally supported by the generations of consuls who came before him. He is presented as the culmination of history. But when we understand the arch as a monument erected by the Senate and not by Augustus himself, it becomes harder to see him as destroying or eclipsing their memory. Instead, they are a forceful reminder that the new regime depended on a certain version of the past – and indeed the present and future.

7. Conclusion: the future

I began this chapter by analysing the way the lists are laid out on the stone. One oddity remains to be explained. As is well known, the triumph lists have a firm end point. The four pilasters, when complete, were full: there is no room on the stone for more triumphs after that of Balbus in 19 BCE. They were incised at a single moment according to a plan: we must imagine that the triumphs were tabulated, the pilasters were measured, and the layout of the list designed so as to fill them completely. The consul lists are different. The end of the fourth tablet has not survived, but given the fragments we do have, the known size of the tablets, and our knowledge of the text the missing sections must have contained, Degrassi was able to estimate with some assurance that it would have covered a period until about 11 BCE.[70]

There are problems surrounding every possible date for this monument and its inscription. But one problem has received less interest than the others. Whether the arch and Fasti belongs to 29 BCE (Actian) or some time around 19 BCE (Parthian), the lists were set up in such a way as to leave space for the future: either about eighteen or about eight more years.[71] This was an odd choice on the behalf on the monument's patrons. Surely we would expect it either to leave space extending into the distant future or to come to a halt with the moment it was erected?

[70] Degrassi 1947 139.

[71] Hirschfeld 1875 97-9 prefers to think that the consul lists were all inscribed at a single moment, and so the date of the entire monument must be about 11 BCE. This seems unacceptably late for the erection of any of the Augustan arches.

The Fasti Capitolini refuse to pass in silence over contemporary history, even the most unsavoury parts, but what is more, they refuse to accede to any suggestion of the end of history. In fact, they emphasise continuity in the past and expect it in the future. The fact of leaving room for a few more years could be a deliberate and calculated move, a statement from Senate to Princeps. In this, like all honours and honorific monuments, the Fasti Capitolini are prescriptive as well as descriptive. They make a clear statement about what exactly the Augustus has done to deserve the honour, and demand more of the same in the future; what is more, they claim that senatorial favour, the favour of the group who were the present heirs of these great consuls of the past, was vital to the success of the new regime.

The Fasti Capitolini view history through the 'Republican' rhythm of consular years. They emphasise a group identity (of the senatorial elite, but through them also of the *res publica* as a whole) which is greater than any one individual, and could not be a more marked contrast to Republican competition or the millennialism we find in some other Augustan-period attitudes to history. The inscriptions allowed the viewer to trace by eye good times and bad times, as measured by the regularity of the cycle of consulships, and thus asked for regularity in future. In setting them up, the Senate made a claim that Rome had for centuries been based on consuls, and must continue to be based on consuls. We could even see the new regular pattern of the 'fifth tablet' as Augustus' response (again, validated and approved by the Senate). The arrangement of the inscriptions on the monument focused the viewer's attention in particular on the Middle Republic, highlighted in the central archway. This collective Golden Age, rather than any individual's successes, was proposed as an *exemplum* for the *res publica*. And unlike Augustus and his own Golden Age, balanced precariously on the intersection between present, future, and mythical past, the Senate claimed historical and epistemological validity for the period they set up as a model. The paradigm of history they offered, not just to Augustus but to any viewer, was both innovative and strikingly different to the dominant Augustan model as displayed in the nearby gallery of exceptional, exemplary *summi viri*. This was an inclusive, collective version of Roman history and memory, watched over by and indeed metonymous with the Senate themselves.

Alföldy, G. 1991: 'Augustus und die Inschriften: Tradition und Innovation', *Gymnasium* 98, 289-324.
Barchiesi, A. 1997: *The Poet and the Price: Ovid and Augustan Discourse*, Berkeley.
Beck, H. 2003: 'Den Ruhm nicht teilen wollen -- Fabius Pictor und die Anfänge des römischen Nobilitätsdiskurses', in U. Eigler, U. Gotter, N. Luraghi and U. Walter (eds), *Formen römischer Geschichtsschriebung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen, Autoren, Kontexte*, Darmstadt: 73-92.
Brunt, P. A. 1984: 'The role of the Senate in the Augustan regime', *Classical Quarterly* n.s. 34, 423-44.
Chastignol, A. 1973: 'La naissance de l'*ordo senatorius*', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome; Antiquité* 85, 583-607.
Chioffi, L. 1995: 'Fornix Fabianus', in *LTUR*, II: 264-66.
---. 1996: *Gli elogia augustei del Foro Romano : aspetti epigrafici e topografici*, Opuscula Epigraphica 7, Rome.
Coarelli, F. 1985: *Il Foro Romano II: periodo reppublicano e augusteo*, Rome.
Corbier, M. 2013: 'Writing in Roman public space', in G. Sears, P. Keegan and R. Laurence (eds), *Written Space in the Latin West, 200 BC to AD 300*, London: 13-47.
Crawford, M. H. (ed.) 1996: *Roman statutes*, London [= BICS Suppl. 64].
Degrassi, A. 1945-6: 'L'edificio dei Fasti Capitolini', *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia* 21, 57-104.
---. 1947: *Inscriptiones Italiae* vol. XIII.1, Rome.
Eck, W. 2010: 'Emperor and senatorial aristocracy in competition for public space', in B. Ewald and C. Norena (eds), *The Emperor and Rome*, New Haven: 111-34.
Eder, W. 1990: 'The Augustan principate as binding link', in K. A. Raaflaub and M. Toher (eds), *Between Republic and Empire. Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate*, Berkeley: 71-122.
Feeney, D. C. 2007: *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*, Berkeley.
Freyberger, K. S. 2009: *Das Forum Romanum. Spiegel der Stadtgeschichte des antiken Rom*, Mainz.
Frier, B. W. 1999: *Libri annales pontificum maximorum: the origins of the annalistic tradition*, Ann Arbor. 2nd edn.
Gatti, G. 1945-6: 'La ricostruzione dell'Arco di Augusto al Foro Romano', *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia* 21, 105-22.
Geiger, J. 2008: *The First Hall of Fame: A Study of the Statues in the Forum Augustum*, Leiden.
Gildenhard, I. 2003: 'The 'annalist' before the annalists: Ennius and his *Annales*', in U. Eigler, U. Gotter, N. Luraghi and U. Walter (eds), *Formen römischer Geschichtsschriebung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen, Autoren, Kontexte*, Darmstadt: 93-114.
Gowing, A. M. 2005: *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*, Cambridge.
Hannah, R. 2013: 'Time in written space', in G. Sears, P. Keegan and R. Laurence (eds), *Written Space in the Latin West, 200 BC to AD 300*, London: 83-102.
Heslin, P. 2015: *The Museum of Augustus: The Temple of Apollo in Pompeii, the Portico of Philippus in Rome, and Latin Poetry*, Los Angeles.
Hirschfeld, O. 1875: 'Die Kapitolinischen Fasten', *Hermes* 9, 93-108.
Holland, L. B. 1946: 'The triple arch of Augustus', *American Journal of Archaeology* 50, 52-59.
Hurlet, F. 2011: 'Consulship and consuls under Augustus', in H. Beck, A. Duplá, M. Jehne and F. Pina Polo (eds), *Consuls and Res Publica: Holding High Office in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge.

Itgenshorst, T. 2004: 'Augustus und der republikanische Triumph. Triumphalfasten und summi viri-Galerie als Instrumente der imperialen Machtsicherung', *Hermes* 132, 436-58.
Johnson, J. R. 1976: *Augustan progaganda: the battle of Actium, Mark Antony's will, the Fasti Capitolini Consulares, and early imperial historiography*, diss., Los Angeles.
La mémoire perdue. Recherches sur l'administration romaine 1998, Rome [= Collection de l'École française de Rome 243].
Lange, C. H. 2009: *Res Publica Constituta. Actium, Apollo and the Accomplishment of the Triumviral Assignment*, Leiden.
Lendon, J. E. 1997: *Empire of honour: the art of government in the Roman world*, Oxford.
Mayer, E. 2010: 'Propaganda, staged applause, or local politics? Public monuments from Augustus to Septimius Severus', in B. Ewald and C. Norena (eds), *The Emperor and Rome*, New Haven: 119-27.
Meadows, A. and Williams, J. 2001: 'Moneta and the monuments: coinage and politics in Republican Rome', *Journal of Roman Studies* 91, 27-49.
Millar, F. 1988: 'Imperial ideology in the Tabula Siarensis', in J. Gonzalez and J. Arce (eds), *Estudios sobre la Tabula Siarensis*, Madrid: 11-19.
Moatti, C. 1997: *La raison de Rome. Naissance de l'esprit critique à la fin de la République (IIe-Ier siècle avant Jésus-Christ)*, Paris.
Nedergaard, E. 1988a: 'Nuove indagini sull'Arco di Augusto nel Foro Romano', *Quaderni del Centro di Studio per l'archeologia etrusco-italica* 16, 37-43.
---. 1988b: 'Zur Problematik der Augustusbögen auf dem Forum Romanum', in Hofter (ed.), *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik : eine Ausstellung im Martin-Gropius-Bau, Berlin, 7. Juni-14. August 1988*: 224-38.
---. 1993: 'Arcus Augusti 1-2', in *LTUR* (ed.): 80-85.
---. 1994-5: 'La collocazione originaria dei *Fasti Capitolini* e gli archi di Augusto nel Foro Romano', *Bullettino della Commissione archeologica Comunale di Roma* 96, 33-70.
---. 2001: 'Facts and fiction about the *Fasti Capitolini*', *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 27, 107-27.
---. 2004: 'Restructuring the *Fasti Capitolini*', *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 30, 83-99.
Nicolet, C. 1976: 'Le cens sénatorial sous la république et sous Auguste', *Journal of Roman Studies* 66, 20-38.
Ogilvie, S. P. 1997: *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI-X*, Oxford.
Östenberg, I. 2009: 'From conquest to *pax Romana*. The *signa recepta* and the end of the Triumphal Fasti in 19 BC', in O. Hekster, S. Schmidt-Hofner and C. Witschel (eds), *Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire*, Leiden: 53-75.
Rawson, E. 1972: 'Cicero the Historian and Cicero the Antiquarian ', *Journal of Roman Studies* 62, 33-45.
Rich, J. W. 1998: 'Augustus' Parthian honours, the temple of Mars Ultor and the arch in the Forum Romanum', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 53, 71-128.
Rodriguez-Mayorgos, A. 2007: 'Antes de la historia: Anales Máximos, escritura y memoria en la Roma Republicana', *Gerión* 25, 263-84.
Roller, M. B. 2001: *Constructing autocracy : aristocrats and emperors in Julio-Claudian Rome*, Princeton, N.J.
---. 2018: *Models from the Past in Roman Culture: A World of Exempla*, Cambridge.
Rose, C. B. 2005: 'The Parthians in Augustan Rome', *American Journal of Archaeology* 109, 21-75.
Rowe, G. 2002: *Princes and political cultures : the new Tiberian senatorial decrees*, Ann Arbor.
Rüpke, J. 1995a: 'Fasti: Quellen oder Produkte römischer Geschichtsschreibung', *Klio* 77, 184-202.
---. 1995b: *Kalender und Öffentlichkeit: Die Geschichte der Repräsentation und religiösen Qualifikation von Zeit in Rom*, Berlin.
---. 2006: 'Ennius's *Fasti* in Fulvius's temple: Greek rationality and Roman tradition', *Arethusa* 39, 489-512.
---. 2011: *The Roman Calendar from Numa to Constantine: Time, History, and the Fasti*, Malden, MA.
Russell, A. Forthcoming: 'Inventing the imperial Senate', in J. Osgood, K. Welch and K. Morrell (eds), *The Alternative Augustan Age*, Oxford.

Schäfer, T. 1998: *Spolia et signa: Baupolitik und Reichskultur nach dem Partherfolg des Augustus*, Göttingen.
Scheid, J. 1990: *Romulus et ses Frères: le College des Frères arvales. Modèle du culte public dans la Rome des empereurs*, Paris.
Shaya, J. 2013. 'The public life of monuments: the *summi viri* of the Forum of Augustus', *American Journal of Archaeology* 117, 83-110.
Simpson, C. J. 1993: 'The original site of the Fasti Capitolini', *Historia* 42, 61-81.
Smith, C. J. 2011: 'The magistrates of the early Roman republic', in H. Beck, A. Duplá, M. Jehne and F. Pina Polo (eds), *Consuls and Res Publica: Holding High Office in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge: 19-40.
Spannagel, M. 1999: *Exemplaria principis: Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums*, Heidelberg.
Steinby, E. M. 1987: 'Il lato orientale del Foro Romano', *Arctos* 21, 139-84.
Stewart, P. 2008: *The Social History of Roman Art*, Cambridge.
Stiehl, R. 1957: *Die Datierung der Kapitolinischen Fasten*, Tübingen.
Syme, R. 1939: *The Roman revolution*, Oxford.
Talbert, R. J. A. 1984: *The Senate of imperial Rome*, Princeton.
Taylor, L. R. 1946: 'The date of the capitoline *Fasti*', *Classical Philology* 41 (1), 1-11.
---. 1951: 'New indications of Augustan editing in the Capitoline *Fasti*', *Classical Philology* 46 (2), 73-80.
Urso, G. 2005: *Cassio Dione e i magistrati. Le origini della repubblica nei frammenti della Storia romana*, Milan.
---. 2011: 'The origin of the consulship in Cassius Dio's *Roman History*', in H. Beck, A. Duplá, M. Jehne and F. Pina Polo (eds), *Consuls and Res Publica: Holding High Office in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge.
Varhelyi, Z. 2010: *The Religion of Senators in the Roman Empire*, Cambridge.
Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1982: 'Civilis princeps: between citizen and king', *Journal of Roman Studies* 72, 32-48.
---. 1987: 'Time for Augustus : Ovid, Augustus and the Fasti', in Bramble et al. (ed.): 221-30.
---. 1990: 'Roman arches and Greek honours: the language of power at Rome', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 35, 143-81.
---. 2005: 'Mutatas formas : the Augustan transformation of Roman knowledge', in Galinsky (ed.): 55-84.
Woolf, G. 1996: 'Monumental writing and the expansion of Roman society in the early Empire', *Journal of Roman Studies* 86, 22-39.
Zanker, P. 1988: *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Ann Arbor.